

Selective Recent Bibliography

Accompanying ACRL Together Wherever Virtual Event on

Open Peer Review: Considerations for Authors & Reviewers

9 June 2020

Open Peer Review has been tested and in trial for nearly a decade and studied long before that. With the emphasis of our program on applications in the Library & Information Science literature, one can't be remiss and see how other disciplines treat open peer review and what they have learned from it. With scholarly communications continuing to evolve and the open access movement expanding, with scholars around the globe working remotely and collaboratively it is essential to see the potential for open peer review, greater transparency and new editorial and submission processes in academic and scholarly publishing. This limited bibliography highlights common themes and provides a recap of the most recent output on common themes.

ACRL's Publications in Librarianship Monograph Series Announces First Open Peer Review (2020). *College & Research Library News* 81(3): 112.

<https://crln.acrl.org/index.php/crlnews/article/download/24314/32115>

Atjonen, P. (2018). Ethics in Peer Review of Academic Journal Articles as Perceived by Authors in the Educational Sciences. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 16(4), 359-376. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-018-9308-3>

Boldt, A. (2011). Extending ArXiv.org to Achieve Open Peer Review and Publishing. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 42(2): 238-242. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.42.2.238>

Bravo, G, Grimaldo, F., Lopez-Inesta, E., Mehmani, B., & Squazzoni, F. (2019). The Effect of Publishing Peer Review Reports on Referee Behavior in Five Scholarly Journals. *Nature Communications* 10:1, 10(1), 322-322. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-08250-2>

Burley, R. (2017). Peer Review in the 21st Century. *Information Services & Use*, 37(3): 259-261. <https://doi.org/10.3233/ISU-170850>

Cassella, M. and Cassella, M. (2018). Tools and Methods of Innovation in the Open Science: Open Peer Review [Strumenti e metodi di innovazione nel panorama dell'open science: L'open peer review]. *AIB Studi*, 58(1), 95-107. <https://doi.org/10.2426/aibstudi-11714>

Chawla, D.S. (2019). Rare Trial of Open Peer Review Allays Common Concerns, *Nature*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-00500-7>

Clobridge, A. (2016). Open Peer Review: The Next Wave in Open Knowledge? *Online Searcher: Information, Discovery, Technology, Strategies* 40 (4): 60-62.

Dali, K. & Jaeger, P.T. (2018). Beyond Scholarly Publishing: The Human Dimension of Peer Review in LIS. *The Library Quarterly* 88(2), 99-124. <https://doi.org/10.1086/696578>

De Magalhães, J.P. (2016). Open Peer Review. Blog Post. http://jp.senescence.info/thoughts/open_peer_review.html

Enslin, P. & Hedge, N. (2018) On Peer Review as the ‘Gold Standard’ in Measuring Research Excellence: From Secrecy to Openness? *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 52(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12312>

European Commission. (2019). *Future of Scholarly Publishing and Scholarly Communication: Report of the Expert Group to the European Commission*. <https://doi.org/10.2777/836532>

Eysenbach, G. (2015). Peer-Review 2.0: Welcome to JMIR Preprints, An Open Peer-Review marketplace for Scholarly Manuscripts. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 17(1),1. <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.5337>

Fitzpatrick, Kathleen, and Avi Santo (2012). *Open Review : A Study of Contexts and Practices. Report from the Andrew Mellon Foundation*. https://mellon.org/media/filer_public/20/ff/20ff03e0-17b0-465b-ae82-1ed7c8cef362/mediacommons-open-review-white-paper-final.pdf

Ford, E. (2019). Moving Peer Review Transparency from Process to Praxis. *Insights*, 32(1): 27. [doi: 10.1629/uksg.480](https://doi.org/10.1629/uksg.480)

Ford, E. (2018). Scholarship as an Open Conversation: Utilizing Open Peer Review in information Literacy Instruction. *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*. <http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2018/open-conversation/>

Ford, E. & Budd, J. (2018). Considering Developmental Peer Review: Editorial. *College & Research Libraries*, 79(6): 718-725. <https://crl.acrl.org/index.php/crl/article/view/17262/18992>

Ford, E. (2017). Advancing an Open Ethos with Open Peer Review. *College & Research Libraries*, 78(4), 406-412. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.78.4.406>

Ford, E. (2016). Opening Review in LIS Journals: A status report. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*. 4. <https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2148>

Ford, E. Open Peer Review at Four STEM Journals: An Observational Overview. *F1000Research* 4 (2015): 6–6. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.6005.2>.

Ford, E. (2013). Defining and Characterizing Open Peer Review: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 44, no. 4 (July 1, 2013): 311–26. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.44-4-001>.

Ford, E. & Bean, C. (2012). Open Ethos Publishing at Code4Lib Journal and in the Library with the Lead Pipe. *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*, 1-12. <http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2012/open-ethos-publishing/>

Groves, T., & Kahn, K. (2010). Is Open Peer Review the Fairest system? *BMJ (Clinical Research Ed.)*, 341 (November), c6424-6424. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21081602>

- Hachani, S. (2015). Open Peer Review: Fast Forward for a New Science. *Advances in Librarianship*, 39: 115-141. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0065-283020150000039012>
- Hare, S., Evanson, C., Kaspar, W.A., Budd, J.M. & Ford, E. (2018). Considering Developmental Peer Review. *College & Research Libraries* 79 (6): 718–25. <https://crl.acrl.org/index.php/crl/article/view/17262/18992>
- Herber, O.R., Bradbury-Jones, C., Boling, S., Combes, S., Hirt, J., Koop, Y., Nyhagen, R. Veldhuizen, J.D., & Taylor, J. (2020). What Feedback do Reviewers Give When Reviewing Qualitative Manuscripts? A Focused Mapping Review and Synthesis. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 20: 122. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-020-01005-y>
- Hodonu-Wusu, J.O. (2018). Open Science: A Review on Open Peer Review Literature. *Library Philosophy & Practice*: 1-19. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5217&context=libphilprac>
- Hooper, M (2019). Scholarly Review, Old and New. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 51(1) 63-75. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.51.1.04>
- Jackson, L., Peters, M. A., Benade, L., Devine, N., Arndt, S., Forster, D., Gibbons, A., Grierson, E., Jandrić, P., Locke, K., Mihaila, R., Stewart, G., Tesar, M. Roberts, P., Ozonlins, J.J., Jackson, L., Peters, M.A., Benade, L., Devine., N., ...Ozolins, J.J. (2018). Is Peer Review in Academic Publishing Still Working? *Open Review of Educational Research* 5(1), 95-112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23265507.2018.1479139>
- Jana, S. (2019). A History and Development of Peer–Review Process. *Annals of Library & Information Studies*. 66(4), 152-162. <http://op.niscair.res.in/index.php/ALIS/article/download/26964/465477310>
- McNutt, M. (2018) Transparency in Authors’ Contributions and Responsibilities to Promote Integrity in Scientific Publication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115 (11): 2557-2560. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1715374115>
- Nobarany, S. & Booth, K.S. (2015). Use of Politeness Strategies in Signed Open Peer Review. *Journal of the American Association for Information Science & Technology*, 66 (5): 1048-1064. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23229>.
- Parks, S, Gunashaker, S, Smith, E. (2017). Use of Open Review by Discipline, Country, and Over Time: An analysis of reviews and journal policies posted on Publons. *International Congress on Peer Review and Scientific Publication*, Chicago. <https://peerreviewcongress.org/prc17-0264>
- Peng., L. & Du, X. (2018). Research on the Implementation of Open Peer Review Strategy in Scientific Journals. *Chinese Journal of Scientific and Technical Periodicals*, 29(11).
- Perakakis, P., Taylor, M., Mazza, M & Trachana, V., (2011). Understanding the Role of Open Peer Review and Dynamics. *Scientometrics* 88(2): 669-673. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-011-040201>
- Pöschl, Ulrich, and U. Poschl. (2010). Interactive Open Access Publishing and Public Peer Review: The Effectiveness of Transparency and Self-Regulation in Scientific Quality Assurance.” *IFLA Journal* 36 (1): 40–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0340035209359573>

- Rampelotto, P.H. (2014). Opening up Peer Review in Life: Towards a Transparent and Reliable Process. *Life* 4 (2): 225-226. <https://doi.org/10.2290/life4020225>
- Rebernig, C.A. (2018). Reviewing the Review Process: Investigation of Researchers' Opinion on Different Methods of Peer Review. MS Thesis at the University of Boras. <http://hb.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1231764/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Reeker, J. (2020). Open Peer Review: A Time for a Closer Look. Blog post. <https://blogs.biomedcentral.com/bmcblog/2020/04/29/open-peer-review-time-for-a-closer-look/>
- Rodriguez, B.B., Nicholas, D., Herman, E., Boukacem, Z.C., Watkinson, A., Xu, J., Abrizah, A. & Swigon, M. (2017). Peer Review: The Experience and Views of Early Career Researchers. *Learned Publishing* 30 (4): 269-277. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1111>
- Ross-Hellauer, T. (2018). Editorial Transitioning Publications to Open Peer Review. *Publications* 6 (2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications6020028>
- Ross-Hellauer, T. (2017). What Is Open Peer Review? A Systematic Review. *F1000Research* 6 (1): 588. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.11369.2>
- Schmidt, B., Ross-Hellauer, T., vanEdig, X. & Moylan, E.C. (2018). Ten Considerations for Open Peer Review. *F1000 Research* 7, 969. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.15334.1>
- Schmidt, B. & Gorogh, E. (2017). New Toolkits on the Block: Peer Review Alternatives in Scholarly Communication. In *Expanding Perspectives on Open Science: Communities, Cultures and Diversity in Concepts and Practices, Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Electronic Publishing*: 62-74. Amsterdam: IOS. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pr2.2017.14505401170>
- Schmidt, B., Deppe, A., & Bodier, J. (2016). Peer Review on the Move from Closed to Open. In F. Loizoides, & B. Schmidt, eds, *Positioning and Power in Academic Publishing: Players, Agents and Agendas, Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Electronic Publishing*: 91-98. Amsterdam: IOS. <https://doi.org/10.3233/978-1-61499-649-1-91>
- Sciullo, N.J. & Duncan, M. (2019). Professionalizing peer Review Suggestions for a More Ethical and Pedagogical Review process. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 50 (4), 248-264. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.50.4.02>
- Tattersall, A. (2015). For What it's Worth: The Open Peer Review Landscape. *Online Information Review*, 39(5): 649-663. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-06-2015-0182>
- Teixeira da Silva, J.A. (2019). Challenges to Open Peer Review. *Online Information Review*, 43 (2): 197-200. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-04-2018-0139>
- Vesnic-Alujevic, L. (2014). Peer Review and Scientific Publishing in Times of Web 2.0. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 20(1): 39-49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-01409345-8>

Walsh, E., Rooney, M., Appleby, L., & Wilkinson, G. (2000). Open Peer Review: A Randomised Controlled Trial. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 176, 47–51. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.176.1.47>

Wang, P. & Tahamtan, I. (2017). The State-of-the-Art of Open Peer Review: Early Adapters. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 54(1) 819-20. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.2017.14505401170>

Wicherts, J. M. (2016). Peer review quality and transparency of the peer-review process in open access and subscription journals. *PLoS ONE*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0147913>

Wolfram, D. Wang, P., Hembree, A., Park, H. (2020). Open Peer Review: Promoting Transparency in Open Science. *Scientometrics* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03488-4>

Wolfram, D., Wang, P., & Park, H. (2019). Open Peer Review The Current Landscape and Emerging Models. *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Scientometrics & Informetrics*, September 2-5, Rome, Italy: 387-398. https://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1058&context=utk_infosciopubs

Zhang, D.C., Smith, R.W., & Lobo, S. (2020). Should You Sign Your Reviews? Open Peer Review and Review Quality. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice* 13(1):45-47. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.20205>

Compiled by Julia Gelfand (jgelfand@uci.edu) and Emily Ford (forder@pdx.edu), June 2020